

PATENT
Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 01413.0011-00000

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of extending a personal interview and anticipate scheduling the interview shortly.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-11, 13-14, and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112; claims 1-10, 13-14, 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a); claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

35 U.S.C § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11, 13-14, and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, stating that the meaning of the term "alteration" is not clear. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The specification describes methods and apparatus for providing a graphical depiction of records and their attributes in a manner that is easy for the human mind to assimilate, highlights the most informative features of the data, and enables unexpected relationships to be found. An interactive display of the records and their attributes can be provided by defining a set of graphic images, wherein each graphic image represents a range of values. See, e.g., Summary of the Invention, p. 3, lines 3-10. A visual representation of a record can be altered, which "allows the user to quickly determine which portion of the information is being is shown" (p. 10). Altering may involve, for example, a change of background contrast, color, or another change in a graphic representation of a record (see, e.g., p. 10, lines 1-4, and p. 11, lines 7-12). An example of "alteration" is depicted in Fig. 6, described in the specification as follows:

PATENT
Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 01413.0011-00000

Fig. 6 is diagram showing both map 405 and a galaxy view of records 605. If a record is selected on map 405, the record is highlighted in galaxy 605, and vice versa. Similarly, selecting a group of records of map 405 (as shown by 610) causes the corresponding group of records to be highlighted in galaxy view 605 (as shown by 615), and vice versa. (p. 11, lines 7-12.)

Thus, in Fig. 6, alteration involves a change in the visual representation of records from dots to crosses. Therefore, the term "alteration" would be clearly understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-10, 13-14, and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,986,673 (Martz) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,272,769 (Strnatka).

Applicants traverse this rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the reference or references, taken alone or in combination, must teach or suggest each and every step recited in the claims. Each of these steps must "be found in the prior art, and not be based on applicant's disclosure." M.P.E.P. § 2143. Applicants respectfully submit that these requirements have not been met for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner admits that the primary reference, Martz, "does not expressly teach altering the second visual representation to highlight the selected subset, simultaneous to displaying the first visual representation" (04/08/04 Office Action, p. 5, lines 6-8). The Examiner refers to figures 2 and 3 and col. 3, line 53, to col. 4, line 21, in Strnatka as allegedly curing the deficiency of Martz. However, the Examiner further admits that Strnatka provides a system that "sequentially displays, highlights and further

PATENT
Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 01413.0011-00000

provides an enlarged view of a portion of the emission control system" (Id., lines 13-15, emphasis added). The word "sequential" clearly does not mean "simultaneous."

Strnatka describes an emission control system in which vehicle data is first displayed, as shown in FIG. 2. Strnatka states: "[i]n addition to the initial display as set forth in FIG. 2, the [user] can call a second image, depicted in FIG. 3, which provides an enlarged view 34 of the isolated component. As shown, the enlarged view may be in the form of an overlay to the image 22 of the initial display. . . . Such callup may be performed through entry of an appropriate command through keypad 16 or hand-held control 18." (col. 3, line 62 to col. 4, line 4). Therefore, Strmatka does not teach or suggest altering the second visual representation of a plurality of records to highlight the selected subset, which is simultaneous to displaying the first visual representation.

Thus, Strmatka does not cure the deficiency of Martz. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Martz.

Applicants traverse at least for the reasons stated below. For the 102(b) rejection to be proper, the invention must be identically disclosed in the reference. However, Martz does not disclose:

"A computer-implemented method of interactively displaying records and their corresponding attributes, comprising:

providing a surface map representing a set of records and a set of views for simultaneous display;

PATENT
Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 01413.0011-00000

linking the surface map to the set of views, wherein at least one of the views comprises a visual representation of a plurality of the records in the set;
receiving an input signal selecting a portion of the surface map; and
indicating, in a view linked to the surface map, a plurality of the records corresponding to the selected portion, simultaneous with the displaying the set of views."

In particular, Martz does not disclose "indicating, in a view linked to the surface map, a plurality of the records corresponding to the selected portion, simultaneous with the displaying the set of views." The only example in Martz, where records are indicated in different views simultaneously, is in Figure 8, depicting "hot spotting" over a surface map. As described in Martz, hotspotting "instantly show[s] the object name, attribute name, and value." (col. 11, lines 3-5). Martz further states that Figure 8 shows "[t]he hot spot readout of values for a particular mineral, Skutterudite, and attribute, association with Nickel/Iron deposits, as the cursor moves over" (col. 11, line 7-10, emphasis added). Thus, "the hot spot readout" in Martz does not indicate a plurality of records. For at least this reason, Martz does not disclose every step recited in the claims, and Applicants therefore request withdrawal of the rejection.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

PATENT
Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 01413.0011-00000

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: *Oct 8, 2004*

By: *Therese A. Hendricks*
Therese A. Hendricks
Reg. No. 30,389